

SOME
Modest Animadversions
AND
REFLEXIONS
Upon a
SERMON

Preach'd before the Honourable
House of COMMONS,
By

Doctor West.

ON

*Monday, the 30th of January, being the Day
appointed to be kept, as the Day of the*

MARTYRDOM

Of the Blessed

King CHARLES I.

In a Letter to the abovesaid Doctor.

By EUGENIUS PHILALETHERS.

*Our Fathers have sinned, and we not, and we have
borne their Iniquities, Lament. v. 7.*

LONDON:

Printed in the Year, 1710.

Sach. 53/1(1)



S O M E

Modest Animadversions

A N D

R E F L E X I O N S, &c.

Reverend Doctor,

FOR so I am oblig'd to stile you in point of good Manners, with respect to your Academical Degree, your Sacerdotal Function and particularly for the Honour conferr'd upon you by the Honourable *House of Commons*, in appointing you to preach before them on the 30th of *January*, which has rais'd you somewhat above the common Level of the rest of the inferior Clergy; for a late House of Commons, being dissatisfied at the excessive Liberty taken by a certain Clergyman that preach'd before them, * and suggested, among other things of the same Nature, that the Day of *King Charles I. Martyrdom* ought to be abolish'd; to prevent such leud Insinuations for the future, they were pleas'd to make an *Order*, that for time to come, none should preach before them on that Day, but a *Doctor* of Divinity, or some *Dignitary* of the Church of *England*; under Supposition, I presume,

* Mr. Stee-
vens.

that Men of those Characters would demean themselves in the Discharge of that Duty, with such exemplary Moderation, Integrity, Veracity, Prudence, and Conformity to the Laws of the Land, as might give no Offence to that *Honourable Assembly*, or any of Her Majesty's Leige People. Of this Number, without Doubt, you were thought to be *Doctor*, when you were order'd to preach on the same Day of *Humiliation*, this present Year 1709. But whether you answer'd Expectations, and merited *Double Honour*, in *dispensing the Word faithfully*, will be inquir'd into, in the following Discourse; which I shall manage with a due Respect to your Person, where I am obliged, in Justice to *Truth*, to dissent from your Opinion. The Text you exercis'd your celebrated Talent in Preaching on, was taken out of the Prophecy of the Prophet *Jeremiah*, Chap. 31. Ver. 29. containing these Words.

In those Days they shall say no more; the Fathers have eaten a sour Grape, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge.

Which Words, sayes a great Divine, relate to the Case of the Jewes, when they were carried Captive to *Babylon*. They said, and perhaps truly, *the Fathers have eaten sour Graps, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge*; but they needed not to have look'd further for a Reason of all the Calamities that had befallen them, than to themselves only. They had *had*, indeed, a good King, who after the wicked Reign of *Manasseh*, by which the People had been exceedingly corrupted, had shewn them an excellent Pattern, and had earnestly endeavour'd to reform the State of Things; but it does not appear by the History, that the People were at all reform'd by his Care. And therefore the Prophet *Ezekiel* sharply reproves them, when they were in the Captivity in
Babylon,

Babylon, for laying the Blame of the Bondage, which they then endured, only upon the Transgression of their *Fathers*, in the Reign of *Manasseh*, as if they themselves had done nothing at all to deserve it. *Ezek.* 18. 2. What mean you, that you use this Proverb concerning the Land of *Israel*, saying, *The Fathers have Eaten sour Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge?* He does not say, that there was not then, nor ever had been, any ground in Fact, for that Proverbial Speech; but only asks the Question, What mean you to use this Proverb? In which words it is not implied, that the Poverb was never true; but only that they in particular had no reason to use it; that is, that they had done enough themselves, to deserve all they suffer'd, and a great deal more, and so should not have needed, in excuse as it were of themselves, to have laid all the Blame upon their *Fathers*. And therefore it follows in the next Verse, *As I Live, saith the Lord, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this Powerb in Israel.* Which Words are not to be understood, as if God never had, nor never would inflict Temporal Evils upon Children, for the Sins of the *Fathers*; for he himself plainly declares the contrary, *Exod.* 34. 7. (and in more than ten places besides,) *visiting the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children, and upon the Childrens Children, unto the Third and Fourth Generation.* So that the meaning of those Words, *Ye shall not have occasion to use this Proverb*, I take to be this, that since they were so conceited of themselves, and stood so much in the Justification of their own Innocence; God was resolved to continue his Judgments upon them so long, untill their Eyes should be open'd to see their own Guilt, and to be sensible, that all the sufferings which they had endured, had been no more, than a just Punishment

ment upon them, for their own Transgression only.

This being the natural Importance of the Words of your Text, *Doctor*, its no small Matter of Admiration and Astonishment to many Wise and Learned Men, how it was possible for you, from the Words thus considered, to extort from them the Doctrine of *Resisting lawfully Authority, and the supream Powers*, and make the whole Tenor of your Sermon incline, generally speaking, to abolish the Observation of the 30th of *January*, as I shall shew hereafter. I don't charge you, *Doctor*, with saying these Things in express Words; it's sufficient that you said them in *Substance* only, or by Way of Consecution, in Terms Equivalent, which is as bad, or worse than down right Expressions: For to use ambiguous Phrases for Arguments, or by Inuendo's and bisarious Artifices, to lap up mischeivous Matter in dark, but still intelligible Meaning, is an Affront to the Auditors to whom they are offered, and shews a Design to Impose upon, and Deceive them.

Have you consider'd, *Doctor*, the fatal Consequences that attend the Doctrine of *Resisting* the Supream Powers, even under any Pretence whatsoever? If you have not seriously studied that Point already, I think, with Submission, Sir, its now Time to begin, before your Discourses on that Subject have done more Mischeif in the World? For tho' some *Antimonarchists* may be ready to burst their Spleens with laughing, to find their *Wild Notions* in Government, advanced from the Pulpit, by a Man of your Figure and Character; yet others are ready to break their Hearts with sighing, to hear that Dr. *West* is complementing the Seditious before an Assembly of Her Majesty's most Dutiful and Loyal Subjects, and gratifying the whole Gang of *Papists, Atheists, and Deists*; in justifying Principles, as contrary, (some think,) to the Sentiments
of

of *Primitive Antiquity*, and the Sense of the Church of England, as Light is from Darkneſs. Conſider therefore, and Repent in Time, before you have given greater Trouble to your true Friends, or Re- proach to your Self; for your Sermon has already taken Wind, is upon the Wing, and will fly through the whole Kingdom, at the Expence of your Reputation; What Pleaſure you can take in being the Subject of Coffee-Houſe, Diſcourſes, and Cenſures, I cannot imagine. All Men wonder at what ſhould induce you to preach up *Reſiſtance* before that *Honourable and Loyal Auditory*, in an Age that is too licentious already, and want no Tinder to put them into a Flame; there being Parties among us, that are but too ready to put your Doctrine of Reſiſtance into Practice, upon any Opportunity, though againſt the beſt Queen and Government in the World: Witneſs the late intended Invaſion of *North-Britain*. Men take great Liberties, Sir, in diſcourſing your Inducements, which for the Reaſons above-mentioned, tend generally to your Diſadvantage. What I can remember follows.

Some ſay, you were bred up among the Miſts and Confuſions of thoſe un happy Times, when *Reſiſtance* of Lawful Authority was the diſtinguiſhing Note of *Election*; and Obedience to Superiours, for *Conſcience ſake*, was a certain Mark of *Reprobation*: When to be Peaceable and Loyal was an unpardonable Crime, and to be Seditious and Rebellious was a Cardinal Vertue. Some ſay, it was bred in the *Bone*, and will never be got out of the *Fleſh*; others ſay you imbibed the Notion of *Reſiſtance*, from the unchriſtian Author of *the Chriſtian Rights*, and are more converſant with the Two weekly Scurrilous, Scandalous Papers, than with the *Greek* or *Latin* Fathers. Some employ the common Proverb of the Phyſicians

cians of *Valencia* against you, and say, though you wear a large and long *Canonical Gown*, you have very little Knowledge, or you would not have been imposed upon to preach in Favour of a Principle, that, in its own Nature, is destructive to the *English Nation*; for tho' *Interest* may Byass some, and want of *Understanding* delude others, to be of that Opinion; it will never excuse Men of Sense either here or hereafter. Some say (tho' I hope it is not true) that you were out of Humour with every Body, because not pleas'd with yourself for want of Preferment, and therefore took this Way to procure it; but I am inclin'd to hope, you will make no such Purchase in Prejudice to your own Conscience.

All these Opinions and Censures weigh very little with me, Sir; but that which really affects me, is, that you are reported to have espoused a Notion, that necessarily draws after it such a Train of frightful Consequences, as begot the long and Bloody *Rebellion* in the Days of King *Charles I.* occasion'd the Barbarous *Murder* of that Monarch of Blessed Memory, by his own Subjects, and usher'd in those many Years of *Misery, Anarchy, or Tyranny*, and of great *Confusion*, which immediately followed, and which continued until the Happy Restoration of King *Charles II.* For 'twas the Doctrine of *Resistance* that was the Parent of that Rebellion and Parricide, and is the Nurse of that no less mischeivous Tenet, *vizt That the Supream Power is rightfully lodg'd in the People, who may Embrone, or Deshrone their Monarchs at their Pleasure, and controul and govern all Things at their own Discretion.* A horrid unchristian Notion, that cannot be maintain'd but on Purpose to introduce *Ataxy, Confusion, and every evil Work*; for all Reservations of an Absolute Power in the People, distinct and divided from their

their *Sovereign*, does but Nourish a continual *Ferment*, support divers *Interests*, fill the *Minds* of unsteady *Malecontents* with *Sedition*, *Curiosity*, and *Pride*, and furnish *Envy* and *Ambition* with plausible *Disguises* for their *Malice*, and the *Exaltation* of the *Factions* that promote them; as was evident among the *Romans*, where the *unlimited Power of the People*, was but an *Artifice* to conciliate deluded *Subjects* to the *Tyranny* of the *Senate*.

But to come to your *Sermon*, *Doctor*, wherein you very artfully play the *Body* against the *Head*. it's true, you do not say in exprefs, Words that the 30th of *January* ought to be abolished; but you say that such *Degrees of Wickedness* as ended in the overturning of the *Government*, and in the *Murder* of the *King* himself, are such, as one cannot but wish, out of *Respect* to our *Nation*, might be forever laid in that *Darkness*, where all *Things* are forgotten. I confess, the Words wishing it forgotten, are very *Soft*, not to say *Subtile*; but since Men seldom wish any *Thing*, but what they would have to be done; and that it's never like to be forgotten, while we have an *Annual Authoritative Day*, appointed on purpose to keep it in *Memory*; I think your wish plainly intimates a *Desire* to have it abolish'd, by the same *Powers* that commanded the *Observation* of it; for till it be so effectually done, the *Murder* of *King Charles* will never be laid in that *Darkness*, where all *Things* are forgotten. But grant it a *Wish* only; What *Reason* is there for wishing it forgotten? You allow it to be a *National Sin*, and then I think there is good *Reason*, that the *Day* should be kept *Nationally*; and that we should continue to pray, as the *Church* directs us; *That God would be reconciled to the Land*, and when he makes *Inquisition* for *Blood*, not lay the *Guilt* of that *Innocent Blood*, to the *Charge* of the *People* of the *Land*, nor never require it of *Us*, or our *Posterity*. For this *Reason*, some very *Wise* and

and good Men think, that it ought *not to be forgotten*, nor any Thing suggested to that Purpose, until (at least) the Time of the Divine Threatning shall be expir'd; i. e. *until the Third and Fourth Generation* shall be past and gone, and *the Children, and the Childrens Children* shall be gathered to their Fathers. And to make our Prayers more prevailing, I think 'tis yours, and every Christian's Duty to be careful *to Sin no more, lest a worse Thing come unto us*, and be very Cautious never to give consent to any such Sin, nor to any *Approaches* towards it, which is the likeliest Means we can use, to procure the Entail of Punishment to be cut off for ever. The contrary Opinion possesses but a few *Remarkable* Heads, and is too violent to be permanent, and the Authors of it will never succeed in their Attempts, unless when they assume a Power and Privilege of talking away Mens *Loyalty*, they would deprive Men of their *Reasons* also.

Pray, *Doctor*, why did you employ so many warm Inuendo's against the Observation of the 30th of *January*, as a Day of solemn Fasting, Humiliation, and Prayer, on which to the Dishonour of our Nation, and the Reproach of the Reformed Religion, the King was *Murdered*, and that too, in the most *shameful* Manner, tryed in a pretended High Court of Justice, and by them sentenc'd to be Executed as a Malefactor? Why do you seem so angry with us, for keeping this Day? Is it because you don't like that a Day of Fasting should be kept upon such an Occasion? I hope not, for then you would seem to approve of the Fact. think it was well done, think it was a Thing not to be ashamed, or repented of. *But who can stretch forth his Hand against the Lord's Anointed, and be Guiltless?* If so, we will take the Judgment of the *Scripture* before yours, it was a Sin; and a great one too; and if ever

ever any single Act was such, it was a National Sin, for 'twas done by them that had usurp'd the *Supream* Authority; and there was also too general a Consent of the People to it. There is good Reason therefore, that the whole Nation should be humbled and sorrowful for it, and with one Voice and Cry, deprecate the Punishment thereof.

Having thus, Sir, given you the Reasons for keeping the 30th of *January* a solemn *Fast*, I beseech you to lay them to Heart; and if you find yourself any way concern'd, in endeavouring the abolishing of it, or in palliating the never-enough lamented Villany committed upon it, which indeed exceeded all the common Measures of Wickedness so far, that there is nothing in any History like it, in respect of the many other Sins that concurred to the effecting of it; or else were joined with it, such as, *Pride, Envy, Malice, Covetousness, Theft, Sacrilege, Hypocrisie, Schism, Sedition, Lying, Perjury, Treason, Rebellion*, what not? either going before, or following it: That you would seriously repent of it, and judge yourself, that you may not be judged of the Lord.

You are also pleas'd to say, Sir, *It's a Judgment upon us, to be upbraiding one another, with that Murder, which those that are Dead long ago, were only concern'd in*; Which I take leave to join with your *Wish* about the 30th of *January*; because they are both of the same Complection; for in the former, you wish it might be forgotten, and in this touch of your *Politicks*, you seem to assign a Reason for it; that those might not be upbraided with it, that were concern'd in it, because they are long since Dead; nor by Consequence such as are Living, that justify it, who are living; which are not a few, and Annually keep the 30th of *January* as a Day of *Rejoicing*, at their *abominable Clubs*: And that I may not be thought to slander any Person, I and others can, and will, if required, Name the Persons

p. 23.

that have said, The Beheading of King *Charles I.* was a *Glorious Act*, &c. and the more is the Pity, I know one of them, that is now again in Her Majesty's Service, that said it; though he was discarded at the beginning of Her Reign, for that and other such Misdemeanours. Why then should it be thought a Judgment upon us, when we hear Men talk at this leud Rate to *Reprove* them sharply, since to be Silent, was to sooth them in their Crimes, and share in their Guilt.

Reminding Men of their Crimes, in order to to make them sensible of them, and Repent, is a Christian's Duty. How then, *Doctor*, can you think it a Fault to upbraid the profess'd Enemies of Crown'd Heads, and the Peace of the Kingdom, with their Enormities; since you cannot but know, Sir, that you had no Reason to apply the *Jewish Proverb*, your *Text*, to any *Antimonarchists*, since there are still too many among us, as deeply tainted with those Principles of *Sedition* and *Rebellion*, which brought about the Barbarous Murder of King *Charles I.* as any of their *Fathers*, and who if they had lived in those Days, would have been as forward, as the forwardest were, in unhinging the Government, and destroying the Church; nay, and in bringing their *Sovereign* to the *Block* too, and promoting all the direful Consequences of that fatal Blow; and therefore cannot be said to suffer for the Sins of others, that are Dead; but for their own, who are yet alive, and may they long live to repent.

And is not your joining the *Guilty Dead*, and the *Living Innocent*, in the same Paragraph, a meer *Blind* to *Hoodwink*, your Reader; at least you will excuse me, Sir, for not discerning the Contrary. What Reason was there to suggest, *that any Men were upbraided, whose Fathers were in the Royal Interest, and whose Families have been great sufferers*
by

by it; only for professing themselves of those Principles, which are absolutely necessary to support our Ancient Constitution, the present Establishment, and the Succession in the Protestant Line. * This Suggestion, Doctor, will never pass upon Men of Sense, that are able to fathom the Whirlpit of your meaning; for if any Rude, Indiscreet Person, ever blamed Men for their Fathers being in the Royal Interest; for supporting our Ancient Constitution, the present Establishment, and the Succession in the Protestant Line; he is as much to be blamed as those, that by Preaching up the Doctrine of Resistance, would put ill Notions into Seditious Heads; that might when the Humour took 'em, Rebel, and endeavour to deprive us of the great Blessings, and Benefits we enjoy, under our present happy Establishment, and the Succession in the Protestant Line, which God continue.

That you spoke so very little, and so slightly of the late Civil War, is no wonder; for if you had display'd the Rebels in their proper Colours, you had contradicted yourself: For if the Doctrine of Resistance be true in general Terms, there can be no such Thing in the World as Rebellion. If any Body of Malecontents may rise up against their Sovereign with Impunity; then by this Doctrine, if they are beaten and hang'd, they may be called Rebels, but if they succeed and are Conquerors, then the Act is Meritorious; 'tis the good old Cause, and the Rebels are good Commonwealth's Men, as they were sometime called; which to me, and others that were Educated in the Belief of Obedience for Conscience sake, and think it the safest Tenet for Crown'd Heads, seems a very Novel and strange Doctrine: Therefore you, and others that are for Resistance, should, methinks, set some Bounds to your Doctrine of Resistance, and shew in what extraordinary Cases it

* P. 23, 24.

it is lawful, and in what Cases unlawful, and be very particular in it; which I cannot find yet done by any Pretenders to the Legality of *Resistance*; but all make the Terms so wide and general, that the Shoo will fit the Foot of any *Malecontent*, that has a Mind to put it on; and by this Rule so unlimited, *Jack Straw*, *Watt Tyler*, *Venner*, *King*, and *Keyes*, had a Cast for it; and if they had had Luck, might have had as fair a Title to be uppermost, as *Oliver Cromwell*; but for want of Success, were all deservedly kill'd, or executed as Traytors. Now, good *Doctor*, when you preach this *Doctrine* again, correct your Notes, and make a Difference between what is done by the *Universal Consent*, and *Approbation of the whole Estates of the Kingdom*, and the rash Attempts of a few ungovernable People; for otherwise, there having been ill Men in all Reigns, we may all Rue the Liberty, they may take in practicing the *Doctrine of Resistance*, as we did in the late Civil War, which brought with it so much Bloodshed, Rapine and Contempt of all things Sacred and Humane, and at length completed all, in the Murder of an Excellent Prince, beyond which, *Wickedness* could go no higher.

But to return from this Digression; you were also pleas'd to insinuate, that there were Faults on both sides; but all I can find ascribed to King Charles I. by any impartial Historian, was his Goodness, Lenity, and too great Condescension to his Enemies for Peace Sake, which were very pardonable, with Respect to that great End, Peace, and so cannot be said to be equally faulty with his Enemies, when there was no Truth, Justice or Goodness among them; for tho' by the Ties of Subjection, by their Oathes of *Allegiance*, and by their constant Profession of Fighting for the King, and Defence of his Authority, (as they gave it out,

for training in the Multitude by so deceitfull a
Bait) they were tyed to the Preservation of his
Person; yet they *wash'd their Hands in his Blood*;
and by their pretending Religion and Justice, in
a Fact, so contrary to both, did, as much as in
them lay, bring the foulest Imputations upon both,
that could be.

Further, Sir, you suggest of King Charles, *that what
ever Doctrines some designing Men might maintain: Himself,
neither thought absolute Power the Right of Kings, nor unlimited
Passive Obedience the Right of Subjects*; and this you draw
from that King's sending Assistance to the Rochellers: Which
methinks is an unconsequential Perversion of his Majesty's
Intention, in turning a politick Act of State into a Prin-
ciple of Religion. The French King was forcing his Prote-
stant Subjects to turn Papists, and that he might not, upon
Success, come over and do the like in England, King
Charles endeavour'd to find him Work enough at Home;
as her present Majesty now joins with her High Allies,
to keep the same Prince, Louis XIV. from encroaching
further upon the Rights of his Neighbouring Princes;
knowing, that if his unlimited Ambition should Breakfast
upon Holland, he would endeavour to Dine in England,
and therefore ought to be prevented by confining him at
Home, which is an Act of Prudence and Foresight, and not
a War of Religion; and this was all that King Charles I.
design'd, by sending Assistance to the Rochellers, which
you, Sir, are pleas'd to represent as his Principle in Reli-
gion; whereas, all his Publick Actions and Printed Works
are undeniable Evidences of the contrary. View his se-
cond Letter to Mr. Henderson, where you will find him to
say, *That to reform (as Grosthead said) in ore Gladij cruentandi
is a wicked ungodly Saying*; and at his Mock-Trial before
the Court of High-Injustice, he stoutly and learnedly
maintain'd his own rightful Authority, when Bradshaw
urg'd the contrary against him, (tho' fallly) in the Name
of the Commons of England.

Hitherto, my Discourse for the greatest part,
has been Personal; give me leave now, Sir, in
order to convince you, or at least undeceive o-
thers, to attack the Doctrine of *Resistance* it self,
and therein shew, from the best Authorities, that
it's contrary to the Doctrine of the Bible, and the
Laws of the Land, both Civil and Ecclesiastical;
Contrary

Contrary to the *Establish'd* Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and the Sense of the most learned Protestant Divines of this Age, and is wholly *Papist* and *Fanatical*. And herein, tho' as much might be said, as would fill a large Volume, yet I shall confine my self within the Compass of a *Letter*, and only present you with what I judge most material on this Subject, that I may not take up too much of your Time, or waste my own in Controversy.

I begin with the first Particular, *viz.* that the Doctrine of Resistance, stands in direct Opposition to the *Cannon* of the Holy Scripture; and to prove my Assertion, I take my rise from the Fifth Commandment, on which all Antient and Orthodox Expositors agree, that with relation to Kings, as the *Fathers of their Country*, it laies an indelible Obligation upon all Subjects, of whatsoever Quality, Rank or Degree, to yield Obedience to their Lawfull Sovereigns, and not to withdraw their Allegiance to their Prince, upon any humane Suggestion, or pretence whatsoever; and the Current of the whole Scriptures, clearly evincing the same great Truth, I shall not trouble you, Sir, with more Quotations to the same purpose, only Subjoin an eminent President to that holy Precept in the Person of *David*, who when he had an Advantage against *Saul*, and *Abishai* would have cut him off, he positively for bid him, saying, *Destroy him not, for who can stretch out his Hand, against the Lords annointed, and be guiltless*; and when *Saul* was kill'd, *David* Fasted and Mourn'd, and as his Conscience did before accuse him, for cutting off the *Helm of his Garment*; so now the Arms he bare against him, did trouble his Conscience.

For tho' much may be said for *David* in that Case; he was the designed *Heir* of the Crown by God's Appointment; he was very *unjustly* and *perfidiously* used by *Saul*; he had kept himself on a pure *Defensive*, and *Saul's* being *freretic* and possess'd with an *evil* Spirit, are great Justifications of *David's* having Recourse to Arms; and his being a Man according to *God's Heart*, ought to possess all with that Esteem for him, as not easily to find Fault with him, or with any of his Actions; yet his Army being made up of Men *distressed*, in *Debt*, and *discontented*, is a shrewd Indication, that the Cause was not *over-good*, when he had such a following. Besides, his going to live at *Gath* with the *Uncircumcised*; his cutting off the *Amalekites*, and pretending to *Achish*, that he had destroy'd his own People by an *unjustifiable* Deceit; and, finally, his going out with the Armies of the *Philistines*, and pretending a great Desire to fight against the Enemies of *Achish*, who were no other but *Saul*, his natural *Liege Lord*, and the Armies of *Israel*, (wherein he either acted a very *unsincere* Part, or did really resolve to have engaged against them) are things so manifestly contrary to the Laws of God, that they give a strong Presumption, that the whole Business of his *taking Arms*, was contrary to *Law*, and *Religion*: And this is an Answer to your Saying, * *That David was far enough from being an Instance of thinking it unlawful to stand upon the Defensive*, or to own the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*; That *David's* Conscience did accuse him of having *failed* in his Duty to *Saul*.

From the *Old Testament* Precepts, I proceed to the *New*; and herein I find, *Submitting to every Ordinance of Man, for the Lord's sake*, as clear and positive a Command, as any in the

whole *Bible*, and the Transgression of it as great a Sin, as the Breach of any other Law. And he that doth not punctually observe what is there commanded, he lives in a known Sin, or in the wilful Neglect of a known Duty; and, by consequence, whatever he may profess, he is no good Man; much less a good Christian, who always makes Conscience of one Duty as well as another. Nor must I omit observing, that this Command was laid upon all Christians, *when there was never a Christian King or Governour in the World*; but were all rather Inveterate Enemies to *Christianity* itself, and endeavour'd all they could to destroy and banish it out of the World; yet for all that, all Christians were commanded to Submit, (that is, not Rebel) which shews, that this Duty is to be perform'd to the *Supreme Governour*, as such; not because he is a *Christian*, a just and merciful King or Queen; but because they are *Kings or Queens*, authorized by Almighty God to Rule and Govern us.

And, therefore, the Apostle doth not command us to submit ourselves to the King as *good*, or *kind*, or *just*, but as *Supreme*; so that he that would perform this Duty as he ought, must not only submit to the King, but he must do it only as he is King: And if this be so, it Arraigns all that *conspire* the King's Death, *oppose* his Authority, or take up *Arms* against him: All that *countenance*, assist, or encourage those that do so. All that *supply* them with Men, Arms, Counsel, or Money; all that *sow Sedition*, raise Tumults, or promote Riots and Mutinying, against the Government; all that ever had, or still have, a Hand in *dividing* the King's Subjects, and so in *seducing* them from their Allegiance to him. In

short,

short, all that do any thing in opposition to the King, or strengthen the Hands of them that do so, by *defending* of them, or *adhering* to them; all these may be properly said to *resist* the King, and, by consequence, break the Law, which requires Submission to him. And so do they also, who altho' they do not act, yet *talk* against him; such as St. Jude calls *filthy Dreamers, who defile the Flesh, despise Dominion, and speak evil of Dignities.* And so, according to St. Peter 2. ii. 10. are such as *defame* and censure the King, or his Officers of State, of Injustice, Neglect, or Mal-Administration; such as write or disperse *Libels* against him; such as raise or carry about *Stories* and ill Reports of him, or his Government, to lessen him in the Esteem of the People, and so take off their Love and Affection from Him; for such things plainly tend to the *Disturbance* of his Government, and to the making of his People *uneasy* under it, and ready to catch at all Opportunities of Rising up against it: Therefore, above all, we are obliged, by this Law, not to entertain such *Seditious* Principles, and *Unchristian* Doctrines, which are *destructive* of Government, and dissolve the Bonds of Humane Society; as, *That the King receives his Power from the People, and is accountable to Them for the Exercise of it; that if he neglects his Duty to them, they are not bound to perform theirs to him:* For such Doctrines are not only *contrary* to the Word of God, and the known Laws of the Land, but they directly tend to the Ruin of the Monarchy and the Kingdom; and not only to *Rebelling* against the King, but to the *Murdering* him too, at his *own Gates*, as this Nation has once already found, by woful Experience; and, therefore, ought to shun the Traces to a Second.

Now, Doctor, be pleas'd to see yourself and your Doctrine in this Glass, and then tell me, what you think of both.

St. Paul also, who cannot be suspected for a Flatterer of Kings, said, *Te must needs be Subject, not only for Wrath, but for Conscience sake*, Rom. xiii. 5. but I wave that and many other Texts, to come to the Practice and Example of our great Master, the Holy Jesus, *who was made Perfect through Sufferings*, Heb. ii. 10. the whole Course of whose Life, was a perpetual Tract of doing Good, and bearing Ill; he paid the Tribute when demanded, and charged the Jews, *to render to Cesar the things that were Cesar's*, St. Matth. xxii. And when he was to lay down his Life for us, he submitted himself patiently, not only to the Will of his Heavenly Father, but to the Civil Powers which then govern'd in Judea. Tho' he, as the Heir of all things, might have claim'd the Empires of the World as his Right; yet since he humbled himself so as to be born in the low Character of a Subject, he in that, as in all other things, became a perfect Pattern to us of all Righteousness. When the accursed Band came out against him, tho' he could have brought down Legions of Angels for his Relief; yet he not only submitted himself to them, but both rejected and reprov'd St. Peter's too forward Zeal, and told him, that *such as drew the Sword, should perish by the Sword*: And when the ill-guided Fervour of that great Apostle, had misled him to the excess of smiting with the Sword, our Saviour express'd his Displeasure at it, by his miraculous piecing the Ear again with the maimed Head. And when he was accused to Pilate, of being an Enemy to Cesar, and pretending to set up another Kingdom, he did, in the plainest

plainest Stile was possible, condemn all *practisings against Government, upon pretence of Religion*; by saying, *My Kingdom is not of this World*; which so expressly discharges all *bustling and fighting* on the pretence of Religion, that we must either set up for *another Gospel*, or utterly reject what is so formally condemn'd, by the Author of this we profess to believe.

The blessed Apostles, and primitive *Saints and Martyrs*, follow'd the Steps of their Master, and chose rather to Suffer, than to Sin; and to be patient *Martyrs*, than prosperous *Rebels*; and therefore, never Resisted under a Succession of *Three Ages*, and *Ten Persecutions*. Nay, when Christianity began to spread by a prodigious Increase, so did the Spite of the infernal Furies; so that in the last Persecution, which continu'd about *Twenty Years*, we find the Martyrs of one Province (*Egypt*) reckon'd to be between 8 and 9000000; and yet no Tumults were raised against all this Tyranny and Injustice: And tho' after the Emperors turn'd Christians, and establish'd the Faith by *Law*, yet neither the subtile Attempts of *Julian* the Apostate, nor the open Persecutions of some *Arrian* Emperors, who did, with great Violence, persecute the *Orthodox*, occasion any seditious Combinations against Authority. These are the great Precedents this holy Doctrine, of *being subject for Conscience sake*, hath given us, in the First and Purest Ages; and tho' Religion suffer'd great Decays in the Succession of many Ages, yet for the first *Ten Centuries*, no Father, or Doctor of the Church, nor any *Assembly* of Churchmen, did ever Teach, Maintain, or Justify any Rebellion, or seditious Doctrines or Practices.

So that according to this Doctrine, Sir, which you are obliged to Assent to, or Refute, for the Satisfaction of the Publick, you must, it seems, find out another Gospel, (which I know nobody pretends to have, but *Marion* the false Prophet) or your Doctrine of *Resisting the Supreme Powers* will dwindle into nothing but your own Disreputation, for endeavouring to support the Doctrines of *Jesuits* and *Fanatics*; Doctrines of so pernicious a Consequence to the *Publick Peace*, that it's enough to make us reject them as false, without examining them further.

2. The Doctrine of *Resistance* is contrary to the Laws of the Land, who have nothing more at Heart, than the *Security* of the King's Person, the Maintenance of his Authority, and the Preservation of the *Publick Peace*; all which are equally in Danger, if Men may resist Authority with Impunity; But our Laws have determin'd the contrary, and made all Resistance of *Sovereign Power* by Subjects, whether by open *War*, or private *Conspiracies*, to be *High Treason*, because they design the Destruction of the King and Kingdom; for there is no such thing in Nature as a *Defensive War* against the King by his Subjects; nor can such Pretences to *Reformation*, countervail the Mischiefs of *Rebellion*. Nothing in Nature can go higher than its first Cause, and a Power derived from the King, cannot be understood to be against the King; no Power can create a Power against itself; and all Attempts to bring a King under the Power of his People, are the same as to destroy him, as it was resolved in the Case of the Earl of *Essex*. Judge *Jenkins* says, To depose the King, or take him by Force, or imprison him, until he hath yielded to certain Demands, is adjudged *Treason*, in the
Lord

Lord Cobham's Case. The Law makes not the Servant greater than the Master, nor the Subject greater than the King; which must be supposed, on the contrary, if any Subjects have a Coercive Power over him. It's High Treason to levy War against the King, or to compass or imagine his Death; and that no Man may be guilty of it, let all that are inclin'd to *Resist*, under any pretext whatsoever, follow the Monition and Counsel of Judge Cook, who says, *Institut. Part 3. p. 36.*

' Peruse over all Books, Records, and Histories,
 ' and you will find a Principle in Law, a Rule in
 ' Reason, and a Tryal in Experience, that Trea-
 ' son does always produce Fatal and Final De-
 ' struction to the Offender, and never attains to
 ' the desired End, (two Incidents inseparable
 ' thereunto) and therefore let all Men abandon
 ' it, and every Step in that Road, as the poison-
 ' ous Baits of the Devil, and follow the Precept
 ' in holy Scripture, *Fear God and Honour the King,*
and have no Fellowship with the Seditious Atheists
and Republicans, that would leave us neither a
God to Worship, nor a King to Honour. To
 sum up all upon this Head, observe what Sir Or-
 lando Bridgman said at the Tryal of the Regicides:
I must deliver to you for plain and true Law, that no
Authority, no Single Person, no Community of Per-
sons, not the People Collectively or Representative-
ly, have any Coercive Power over the King of Eng-
land, whose Crown is, and always was, Imperial.
 Now by this, says he, *I do not intend any Absolute*
Government: It's one thing to have an Absolute Mo-
narchy, another to have that Government absolutely
without Laws, as to any Coercive Power over the
King, which the Laws of England are perfect Stran-
gers to, as you will find by the following Procla-
mation, grounded upon an Act of Parliament.

By

By the King,

A PROCLAMATION,

For Observing of the Thirtieth Day of *January*, as a Day of Fast and Humiliation, according to the late Act of Parliament for that Purpose.

CHARLES R.

Whereas in Our late Parliament held at Westminster, in the Twelfth year of Our Reign, The Lords and Commons therein Assembled, did shew and declare unto Us, That the execrable Murder of Our Royal Father CHARLES the First, of ever Blessed and Glorious Memory, hath been committed by a Party of wretched Men, desperately wicked and hardened in their Impiety, who having first plotted and contrived the Ruine and Destruction of this Excellent Monarchy, and with it the true Reformed Protestant Religion, which hath been so long Protected by it, and Flourished under it, found it necessary, in order to the carrying on of their pernicious and traiterous Designs, to throw down all the Bulwarks and Fences of Law, and to subvert the very Being and Constitution of Parliament, that so they might, at last, make their Way open for any further Attempts upon His Person: And for the more easie effecting thereof, they did then first seduce some part of the then Army into a Compliance, and then kept the rest in Subjection to them, partly for hope of Preferment, and chiefly for fear of losing their Employments and Arrears, until
by

by these and other more Obious Arts and Devices they had fully strengthened themselves both in Power and Faction: Which being done, they did Declare against all Manner of Treaty with the Person of our Royal Father, even then when a Treaty by Advice of both Houses of Parliament was in Being, and did Remonstrate against the Houses of Parliament for such Proceedings, and seized upon the Person of Our Royal Father, while the Commissioners were returned to the Houses of Parliament with his Answer; And when his Concessions had been Voted a Ground for Peace, seize upon the House of Commons, seclude and imprison some Members, force out others; And there being left but a small Remnant of their own Creatures (not a Tenth Part of the Whole) did seek to shelter themselves by this Weak Pretence, under the Name and Authority of a Parliament, and in that Name laboured to prosecute what was yet behind and unfinished of their long-intended Treason and Conspiracy: To that Purpose they prepared an Ordinance for erecting a prodigious and unheard-of Tribunal, which they called An High Court of Justice, for Trial of his Majesty, Our most Dear Father; And having easily procured it to pass their House of Commons, as it then stood moulded, ventured to send it up from thence to the Peers, then sitting, who totally rejected it: Whereupon their Rage and Fury encreasing, they presumed to pass it alone as an Act of the Commons, and in the Name of the Commons of England; and having gained the Pretence of a Law, made by the Power of their own making,

D

pur-

pursued it with all possible Force and Cruelty,
 until at last upon the Thirtieth Day of January,
 One Thousand Six Hundred Forty and
 Eight, his Sacred Majesty, Our late Dear
 Father, was brought into a Scaffold and
 there publickly murdered before the Gates
 of his own Royal Palace. And because by
 this Horrid Action the Protestant Religion
 hath received the greatest Wound and Re-
 proach, and the People of England the most
 Insupportable Shame and Infamy that it is
 possible for the Enemies of God and the King
 to bring upon them, whilst the Fanatick Rage
 of a few Wilcreants (who were as far from
 being True Protestants as they were from
 being True Subjects) stands imputed by Our
 Adversaries to the whole Nation. They, the
 said Lords and Commons in Parliament As-
 sembled, did therefore renounce, abominate,
 and protest, against that Impious Fact, the
 Execrable Murder and Unparallell'd Treas-
 on committed against the Sacred Person
 and Life of Our Royal Father, and did
 beseech us it might be Declared; And it is
 by the said Act Declared, That by the Un-
 doubted Fundamental Laws of this King-
 dom, neither the Peers of the Realm, nor
 the Commons, nor both together in Parlia-
 ment, nor the People collectively or represen-
 tatively, nor any other Persons whatsoever,
 ever had, hath, or ought to have, any Coer-
 cive Power over the Persons of the Kings
 of this Realm. And for the better Vindica-
 tion of themselves to Posterity, and as a
 lasting Monument of their otherwise inexpress-
 sible Detestation and Abhorrency of that
 Villanous and Abominable Fact, They did
 further

further beseech Us that it might be Enacted, and it is therefore Enacted, That every Thirtieth Day of January (unless it should fall out to be on the Lord's Day, and then the next Day following,) should be for ever thereafter set apart to be kept and observed in all Our Churches and Chappels of our Kingdoms of England and Ireland, Dominion of Wales, and Town of Berwick upon Tweed, and the Isles of Jersey and Guernsey, and all other Our Dominions, as an Anniversary Day of Fasting and Humiliation, to implore the Mercy of God, That neither the Guilt of that Sacred Innocent Blood, nor those other Sins by which God was provoked to deliver up both them and their King into the Hands of Cruel and Unreasonable Men, might at any Time after be visited upon them or their Posterity, as by the said Act amongst other Things at large appeareth. We being very sensible of the Pious and Good Intentions of Our said Dutiful and Loyal Subjects, and holding Our Self obliged to do Our utmost Endeavour that a Work so much tending to the Honour and Acknowledgement of the Infinite Mercies of Our Good and Gracious God, who hath been pleased not only to restore Us to the Throne of Our Ancestors, from which We were so long detained, and Our said good Subjects to their Rights and Liberties, and the Nation to Peace, after a Bloody and Unnatural War, and tending to a due Acknowledgement of the Sins which provoked the Justice of God so far as justly to deliver up these Nations to the many and deplorable Calamities which proceeded from, and ensued, that horrid and Bloody

Further of Our most Dear Father, Do
 strictly Command and Enjoin all our Lov-
 ing Subjects, of what Degree, Quality,
 or Condition soever, solemnly and humbly
 to Conform themselves, and give Obedience
 to the said Act of Parliament, and to set
 apart and observe the Thirtieth of January
 this Present Year, and so from Time to
 Time every Thirtieth Day of January every
 Year, as a Day of Fasting and Humiliati-
 on for the Purposes in the said Act of Par-
 liament mentioned: And to that End, We
 Command all Archbishops, Bishops, Par-
 sons, Ministers, and other Ecclesiastical Per-
 sons in their severall Charges, according to
 their severall Duties to take hereof, and to
 cause this our Proclamation to be yearly
 read in all Churches and Chapels the Sun-
 day before the said Fast is to be observed.
 And We strictly Command all Persons what-
 soever, for the better Observation of the said
 Day, to abstain from all Servile Works and
 Business on that Day, and meekly and or-
 derly to repair to the Publick Place for Di-
 vine Worship, to beseech God for his Mercy,
 and humble themselves in his Sight, accor-
 ding to the good Intention of the Act. And
 We declare, That such Persons as shall be
 faulty herein shall be esteemed by Us Con-
 temners and Infringers of Our Laws and
 Commands, Profane Persons, who wil-
 fully shut their Eyes both against the Judg-
 ments and Mercies of Almighty God.

Given at Our Court at *Whitehall* the Twenty-
 fifth Day of *January*, in the Twelfth Year of
 Our Reign, One Thousand Six Hundred and
 Sixty.

God save the King.

Here

Here you have seen, Sir, the Rise and Continuance of all the Troubles in the Reign of King Charles I. and by what Methods the Rebels rose to that *unparalleled* Height of Wickedness, with the Parliaments Censure of them, which has nothing New in it ; for in all those Unhappy Times the main Body of the *Nobility* and *Gentry* stood by the King : So did the whole Sound and Honest Part of the *Commonality*, the *Two Universities*, the *Wise* and most *Learned* in the *Laws*, the whole *Clergy*, and all the *Genuine* Sons of the Church of *England* ; a Church whose Glory it is to have been never tainted with the least Blemish of *Disloyalty*, which will, Sir, put your Doctrine of *Resistance* much out of Countenance when you find it proved, which is my next Business.

3. The Doctrine of *Resistance* is diametrically opposite to the Church of *England*, as by Law establish'd, as appears by Her *Articles*, *Publick Homilies*, *Publick Offices of Devotion*, *General Orders of Her Bishops*, *Censures of Her Universities*, and *Writings of Her Greatest Men*, who have vindicated Her Doctrine, and explain'd Her Belief. The Second Part of the Sermon of Obedience in the First Book of *Homilies*, set forth in the Reign of King *Edward VI.* contain these Words :
 ' Here good People let us diligently mark, that
 ' it is not lawful for *Inferiors* and *Subjects* in any
 ' Case to resist and stand against the Superiour
 ' Powers, for St. Paul's Words are plain, That
 ' *whosoever withstands* (resists) *shall get to them-*
 ' *selves Damnation* ; for *whosoever withstands with-*
 ' *standeth the Ordinance of God*. Which said Book of *Homilies*, is affirmed in One of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* of Religion, which concern the Confession of the True Christian Faith, to contain

a Godly and wholesome Doctrine, and is ordered to be read in Churches by the Minister, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood by the People.

In Confirmation of this Doctrine, and Position contain'd in the Book of *Homilies*, and of the Authority of those Books, in an Act of Parliament of the 13th of Queen *Elizabeth*, Entituled, *An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of Sound Religion*, it is Enacted, ' That no Person ' should hereafter be admitted to any *Benefice* ' with *Cure*, except he should first have *Subscri-* ' *bed* the said Articles in the presence of the *Or-* ' *dinary*, and *publickly* read the same in the Parish ' Church of that *Benefice*, with Declaration of ' his *unfeigned Assent* to the same. And by an Act of the Fifth Year of Her present Majesties Reign, Entituled, *An Act for the securing the Church of England, as by Law established*, it is Enacted, ' That the said Act of the XIIIth of Queen *Eli-* ' *zabeth* shall remain, and be in full force, for ' ever, and be inserted in *express* Terms in any ' Act which shall be made for ratifying the ' Union of the Two Kingdoms of *England* and ' *Scotland*, and therein declared to be an *Essenti-* ' *al* and *Fundamental* Part thereof: And the said Act was accordingly inserted in *express* Terms in an Act for the Union of the Two Kingdoms, and thereby Ratified and Declared to be an *Essential* and *Fundamental* Part thereof. The afore-said Assertion is also agreeable to, and warranted by the *Common Law* of *England*, and divers Acts of Parliament now remaining in full Force.

In the Churches Publick Offices of *Devotion*, contain'd in the *Liturgy*, in the Morning and Evening Service for every Day, God is said to be *the only Ruler of Princes*, inclusive both to Pope and

and People. In the *Litany* we pray God *to deliver us from all Sedition, Privy Conspiracy and Rebellion*; which Words were put into the *Litany* since our late unhappy Civil Wars, that have given us Reason to use them. In the Prayer after the Commandments the King is said to be *God's Minister*, and we beg of God, *That all his Subjects, duly considering whose Authority he hath, we may faithfully Serve, Honour, and humbly Obey him, according to God's Blessed Word and Ordinance*; which is thus admirably commenced on, *viz.* We are to consider that Kings bear God's Name, and act by his Power; *and such as resist do fight against God, oppose his Word, and resist his Ordinance.* In the Office for the Fifth of November we pray God, *That the King may cut off all such Workers of Iniquity as turn Religion into Rebellion, and Faith into Faction.* And in the Office for May XXIX, when we thank God for the Restoration of the Royal Family, we beseech God *to accept of our unfeigned Oblation of our selves, vowing all Holy Obedience in Thought, Word and Work, unto the Divine Majesty, and promising in him, and for him, all dutiful Allegiance to his Anointed Servant, and his Heirs for ever.*

By the Orders of our *Bishops*, I mean such Directions as with the King's Consent, as the Law required, were sent by the Archbishops of *Canterbury* and *York* to the several Bishops of their Provinces, to be put in Execution in their several *Diocesses*, those of *August 4th, 1622*, require,
 ' That no Preacher shall Preach otherwise than
 ' by opening the Coherence and Division of their
 ' Text, which shall not be comprehended and
 ' warranted in Essence, Substance and Effect or
 ' natural Inference; within some one Article, of
 ' Religion set forth *Ann. 1562*, or in some one
 ' of

of the *Homilies*, set forth by Authority. Again,
 That no *Preacher*, of what Title or Denomina-
 tion soever, shall presume henceforth, in any
 Auditory within this Kingdom, to declare, li-
 mit, or bound out, by Way of *positive Doctrine*,
 in any Lecture or Sermon, the Power, Preroga-
 tive, Jurisdiction, Authority, or Duty of *Sove-
 reign Princes*, or therein meddle with *Matters
 of State*, and Reference between Princes and
 People, than as they are instructed in the *Ho-
 mily* of Obedience, and in the rest of the *Homi-
 lies*, and *Articles* of Religion, set forth by Pub-
 lick Authority. Now, Sir, as a professed Son
 of the Church of *England*, and one that has sub-
 scribed the *Articles* of Religion, did you answer
 that *Character*, and obey those Orders prescribed
 by the *Articles*, or directed by the *Homilies*,
 when you Preached in Favour of *resisting the
 Supreme Powers*, and meddled with Matters of
 State and Reference between Princes and People?
 For if you have no Dispensation to say what you
 please, I must say it looks very oddly in this
 Reign, where we have none of the Pretensions to
resist, as was staged for that Purpose in former
 Reigns.

Nor are the *Censures* of our Famous *Universi-
 ties* in this Case to be neglected, or lightly regard-
 ed, which are in such great Reputation Abroad
 and at Home, by all unprejudiced Men of Sence
 and Learning. One Mr. Knight of *Broadgate-
 Hall* in *Oxford*, Preaching at *St. Peter's* in the
 East on *Palm-Sunday*, asserted, That *Subjects be-
 ing persecuted for Religion* might lawfully take
 up Arms in their own Defence, provided that they
 managed their Arms with much Moderation,
 which giving Offence to the University, in a full
 Convocation, June 25th, 1622, this Censure
 was

was passed upon that Occasion. *The Affirmation is False and Seditious, and so craftily restrain'd under such Conditions annexed, as every Seditious Person may make use of to vindicate himself.* Nor did the University rest here, but withal decreed and declared, ' That according to the Canon of the Holy Scriptures Subjects ought by ' no Means forcibly to resist their Prince; and ' that it is not lawful to take Arms, either *Offensive* or *Defensive*, against the King upon the Account of Religion, or any other Pretence. And in concurrence with these Proceedings the University of Cambridge burn'd *Buchanan's Common Places*, and *Junius Brutus's* (or *Hubert Langubh*) *Vindiciæ*, and damn'd the Authors to perpetual Infamy. Having now view'd and considered these *Censures*, and the Occasion of them, you will pardon me, Sir, if I think *plus vident Oculi quam Oculus*. That the Judgment of the Two Universities are to be preferr'd before a single *Lecturer* at *St. Paul's Covent-Garden*.

4. The Doctrine of *Resistance* is contrary to what has been Preach'd and Printed by the most Learned Protestant Divines of the Church of England ever since the Beginning of the Reign of Edward VI. but I shall begin my *Catalogue* in the Reign of King Charles I. when there wanted not some Grave, Good and Learned, Men to oppose that growing and pernicious Error, and to assert the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* and *Non-resistance*, at the Peril of their Lives and all that was near and dear to them.

I begin with Arch-bishop *Usher*, who wrote a Learned Treatise on this Subject, Entituled, ' *The Power of Kings*, and proves, that our Government is a *Free Monarchy*, because the Authority resteth solely in the King, who is the

E

' only

' only Supreme Governour of these Realms, in all
 ' Cases whatsoever, which could not stand if any
 ' other Power upon Earth might in any Case o-
 ' ver-rule him. In another Place in that Book he
 ' treats of the Obedience of Subjects, in which he
 ' plainly shews, that they that resist, resist the Or-
 ' dinance and Disposition of God, by whose Ap-
 ' pointment Kings bear Rule; and then propounds
 ' this Question, ' But how are Subjects to carry them-
 ' selves when such Things are enjoyn'd as cannot, or
 ' ought not to be done? And Answers it thus, ' Sure-
 ' ly not, to accuse the Commander, but humbly to
 ' avoid the Command,—and when nothing else
 ' will serve the Turn, as in Things that may be
 ' obeyed, we are to express our Subjection by
 ' *Active*; so in Things that ought not to be o-
 ' beyed, we are to declare the same by *Passive*
 ' *Obedience*, without *Resistance* and *Repugnancy*;
 ' such a kind of *Suffering* being as sure a Sign of
 ' Subjection as any else whatsoever.

Arch bishop *Bramhall*, in his *Serpentine Salve*,
 says, ' That Dominion is not the Grant or Con-
 ' sent of the People, but from God. If the Peo-
 ' ple be Greater than the King, it's no more a
 ' Monarchy, but Democracy. Our Oath binds
 ' us to acknowledge the King to be Supream in
 ' all Causes, and over all Persons; to defend him
 ' against all Conspiracies; and if to defend, much
 ' more not to offend, him: That Oath which binds
 ' us to defend him against all Attempts whatsoe-
 ' ver, presupposeth that no Attempts against him
 ' can be justified by Law.—Against such evi-
 ' dent Light of Truth, to ground a contrary Affir-
 ' mation derogatory to his Majesty, upon the private
 ' Authority of *Bracton* and *Elera*, (no Authentick
 ' Authors,) were a strange Degree of Weakness or
 ' Wickedness.

Bishop

Bishop *Brownrig* is of the same Opinion, and avers, 'That tho' we must not give *Actual* Obedience to ungodly Laws, yet we must perform our *Passive Obedience* to their Punishments.

Dr. *Hammond* in his *Practical Catechism*, says, 'I shall put you in Mind of this *Great Truth*, that Christ and his Disciples were, of all the Doctors that were in the World, the most careful to preserve the Doctrine and Practice of *Allegiance*, even when the Emperors were the greatest Opposers of the Christian Religion; and if ever you mean to be a Follower of them, you *must go and do like them*.

Bishop *Sanderfon*, in his Preface to Archbishop *Usher's* Book of *The Power of Kings*, says, 'Some Men dream of a *Co-ordination* in the Government, as was hatched in the Heat of our late Troubles, but that Doctrine was never heard of before in this Nation; and is in Truth no better than a *Senseless* and *Ridiculous* Fancy.

Dr. *Taylor*, Bishop of *Down* and *Connor* in *Ireland*, in his *Duct. Dubitant.* says, 'He that lifts up his Hand against the Supreme Power or Authority that God hath set over him, is impious against God, and fights against him. *Rom. 13.* The Apostle doth not say, he that doth not obey is disobedient to God, for this is not true; in some Cases it is *lawful* not to obey, but in all Cases it is necessary not to *resist*; I do not know any Proposition in the World clearer than this Rule.

Bishop *Stillingfleet* in his Sermon *January 30. 1668.* affirms, 'That the Christian Religion above all others hath taken Care to preserve the Rights of Sovereignty, by giving unto *Cesar* the Things that are *Cesar's*; and to make Resistance unlawful, by declaring, that those who are guilty

' of it *shall receive to themselves Damnation.*
 ' Of the Doctrine of *Resistance* he says, that
 ' there can be no Principle imagin'd more Destru-
 ' ctive to Civil Societies, and Repugnant to the
 ' Nature of Government; for it destroys all the
 ' Obligations of *Oaths* and *Compacts*; it makes
 ' every *Prosperous* Rebel Just; and if *Corah*,
 ' *Nathan* and *Abiram*, had succeeded in their Re-
 ' bellion against *Moses*, no doubt they would
 ' have been called *the Keepers of the Liberties*
 ' of *Israel*. The same Learned Author, in his
 ' *Grand Question*, says, ' That every New Model-
 ' ler of Government has something to offer
 ' that looks like Reason, at least to those whose
 ' Interest is to carry it on; and if no *Precedent*
 ' can be found, then they appeal to a certain
 ' *Invisible Thing*, called the *Fundamental Con-*
 ' *tract of the Nation*, which being a Thing no-
 ' where to be found, may signifie what any one
 ' pleases. And p. 75. I am of Opinion, (that if
 ' the Author of the *Letter* about it) could be
 ' perswaded to produce this *Fundamental Contract*
 ' of the Nation, which I perceive he has lying
 ' by him, it would not amount to so much as
 ' a *Blind Manuscript*.

Dr. *Burnet*, the Present Bishop of *Salisbury*,
 in his *Vindication of the Authority of the Church*
 of *Scotland*, says, ' I shall add one Thing which
 ' all *Casuists* hold as a safe Rule in Matters that
 ' are doubtful, *viz.* That we ought to follow
 ' that Side of the Doubt that is freest from Ha-
 ' zard: Here then *Damnation* is at least the
 ' seeming Hazard of *Resistance*; therefore ex-
 ' cept upon as clear Evidence you prove the Dan-
 ' ger of Absolute Submission to be of the same
 ' Nature, that it may ballance the other, then
 ' *Absolute*

‘ *Absolute Submission*, as being the surest, is to be followed.

The same Learned Author in a Marginal Note on Bishop *Bedel's* Letter, desires his Reader to take Notice, ‘ that a Subject's Resisting his Prince ‘ in any Case whatsoever is Unlawful and Impious.

Dr. *Tillotson*, late Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in his Sermon on *Nov. 5. 1708.* says, ‘ There is ‘ a Spirit in the World which is not only contrary to Christianity, but to the Common Principles of Natural Religion, and even to Humanity itself, which by Falshood and Perfidiousness, by secret Plots and Conspiracies, or by open Sedition and Rebellion, by Deposing and Killing Kings, in a Word, by Dissolving all the Bonds of Humane Society, and Subverting the Peace and Order of the World; *i. e.* by all the Ways imaginable, doth encite Men to promote and advance their Religion; but when Religion once comes to supplant Moral Righteousness, and to teach the Absurdest Things in the World, to lie for the Truth, and to kill Men for God's Sake, and to be a Bond for Conspiracy, better it were there was no Revealed Religion, and that Humane Nature were left to the Conduct of its own Principles and Inclinations, which are much more Mild and Merciful than to be acted by a Religion that inspires Men with so Wild a Fury. — Our Church hath this Peculiar Advantage above several Professions that we know in the World, that it acknowledgeth a due and just Subordination to the Civil Authority, and has always been untainted in its Loyalty.

Dr.

* P. 223. Dr. Patrick, late Bishop of Ely, in his Paraphrase and Annotations on *Ecclesiastes*, * advises us as the Wifest Thing we can do, when Princes require any Thing grievous unto us, is not to Rebel, but to watch the Fittest Opportunities to Petition for Redress, and that after such a Manner as may give no Offence; or remove out of his Dominions, rather than contest with him.

These are the Sentiments of some of the Learned and Pious Bishops and Doctors of the Church of *England*, to which if I had but Room I could add more than Ten Times as many: And now to find a Doctor of the same Church to preach up the Contrary Doctrine is able to chill and stagger every Sense about one. If a Papist, Presbyterian, an Independant, an Anabaptist, or Fifth-Monarchist, had held forth on such a Subject, it had been no wonder; but for a Son of, and Dignitary in, the Church of *England* to war with the Holy Scriptures, the Laws of the Land, the Sense of his Reverend Fathers and Brethren, and the Degrees of the Universities, is very shocking.

The last Particular is, That the Doctrine of *Resisting Supream Powers* is wholly Popish and Fanatical: And this I shall prove by such Irrefragible Arguments and Authorities as can never be overthrown. About the End of the Eleventh Century this Pestiferous Doctrine took its Rise, and was first broach'd and vented by Pope Gregory VII. commonly called *Hildebrand*; but Phocas went more briskly to work, and began that Insolent and Bold Pretention of the Temporal Power of the Popes over all Kings and Princes; that they being Christ's *Vicars* on Earth

Earth must have all Power in Heaven and Earth deputed to them; and that as St. Peter's Successors they had the Two Swords, the Spiritual and the Temporal, put into their Hands: Upon this he aspir'd and exalted himself above those whom the Scriptures call *Gods*. Other Popes set the same Pretension on Foot both in *France* and *England*, and took upon them to *Depose* Princes, and *Absolve* their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance; and their Emissaries, Priests, and Jesuits, preach such Doctrines as these; viz. *That the Commonwealth has Power to chuse their own Government; that the Republick may cure or cut off their Heads if they infest the Body; that the whole People are Superior to the Prince, and for the Good of the Publick may order and govern all Things as they please, and think best for their Safety.*

The Sectarists, who value themselves on their abhorring all the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, have yet carried along with them these Pestiferous Opinions, and according to Bishop *Beveridge*, * 'All the Plots' Sermon on 1 Pet. 2. 11. and Conspiracies, Treasons and Rebellions, ' that this Kingdom has been so much barras'd ' and infested with for so many Years, have ' been hatch'd and carry'd on by those who ' separated themselves from the Communion of ' the Church of *England*, i. e. either *Papists* or *Sectarians*: But that which is more strange, is, that any Man of Sense, professing True Religion, should favour and espouse the very same False Notions which his *own* Church condemns.

Having thus, I hope, made good my Promise, Doctor, I come more closely to your Sermon, and begin with that Paragraph, * wherein P. 9. you

you say, That the *Honest Zeal* some express'd against the *Novel and Dangerous Tenets* of *Unlimited Power in the Prince, and Absolute Passive Obedience in the Subject*, gave Opportunities to others to represent them to His Majesty under the *Odious Characters* of *Faction, Turbulent, Spirits, of Republican Principles, and Enemies to his Government*. Is not this Paragraph, Sir, worded too much in Favour of *Faction, Turbulent, Spirits*? Methinks it leans that Way: For otherwise you would not have called it an *Honest Zeal* that is big with a *Falsity*, viz. That the *Doctrine of Passive Obedience is a Novel and Dangerous Tenet*, which are both great Mistakes: For the *Doctrine of Passive Obedience* is as *Ancient* as Christianity, and so far from being *Dangerous*, that it's the great Security, under God's Protection, to all the Monarchs in the World; for among Quiet and Peaceable Subjects they may enjoy their Pleasures, and mind their Publick Affairs, with all Imaginal Serenity and Calmness; whereas among *Faction, Froward, Ambitious, Aspirers*, they are always Suspicious and Uneasie to themselves, and all about them. Nor can *Passive Obedience* be *Dangerous* to Subjects, for they that neither do nor intend Evil have no Cause to dread Oppression; but when Men are Enemies to Governments, the Evil they intend raises such a Ferment within, that they are in continual Apprehension of suffering what their conscience tells them they have deserved, for being enclined to break out into Acts of Hostility, and disturb the Peace of the Kingdom. And to say no more, Sir, your straining the Point, and terrifying the People

People with the frightful Epithets of *Unlimited Power* in the Prince, and *Absolute Passive Obedience* for the People, looks more like humouring of *Parties* in their Discontents, and keeping the ill Notion of *Resistance* afloat ; than teaching Men to *serve God, and keep his Commandments*, which is the great End of *Preaching*, and not haranguing upon *Politicks*, to create Amusements and Misunderstandings between Princes and their People.

But there was a fatal Oversight on both sides, not to discern a Secret Engine of Mischief, a French Faction, that had made its Way, and plaid a double Part amongst them *. In this, Sir, your Historian has impos'd upon you ; for in the *Civil War*, which, I presume, you allude to, *France* acted but a single Part, and that was in revenge of the King's assisting the *Rochellers*, to join with the *Parliament*, and wind them up to the highest Pitch of Rebellion, rather than hearken to any Terms of Accommodation. To this Purpose, besides many *Renegado English Priests and Jesuits*, that, in the Garb of private Centinels, had learn'd the *Preaching Cant* of *Independents, Anabaptists, and Fifth-Monarchists*, and set up for *Gifted Brethren*, to blow the glowing Coals of Strife and Sedition, the *French* had always a Minister in the *English Camp*, who went from *Fairfax's Army* to the *Scotch Army*, as soon as it was known, the King had surrender'd himself to 'em ; with design to embarrass the King's Affairs, and persuade the *Scots* to sell him to the *English*, in which that Minister succeeded so unhappily, as to lay the Foundation-Stone of the King's Murder.

In excuse of those that put your Doctrine of
 * p. 13. *Resistance* in practice, you say, * *It must be own'd,*
that the altering the Constitution of our Church, does
not appear to be an original Design: — Its Fall
was occasion'd through a Dissatisfaction and Hatred to
Churchmen, rather than to the Church itself. Take
that excellent Historian together, and not by
Peicemeals, and you will have cause to alter your
Opinion. Was not the War begun by the Dis-
affected Pulpiteers, who were justly stiled the
Trumpets of Rebellion, as well as the Promo-
ters of the Doctrine of Resistance? Did not they
Preach in the Scots, up the Covenant, and out
the Bishops? To give a fatal Blow to the Church,
did not the Parliament Cut off the Archbishop of
Canterbury, whom they suppos'd to be one of
the Pillars of it? And was not this done too be-
fore the War began? Did not Mr. Pryn, and o-
thers, write with all the Vehemency, Bitterness,
and Indignation against the very Constitution of
the Church, before the War began, as prepara-
tory Stroaks in order to its Fall, when Gog and
Magog should be Powerful enough to undertake
it? How then, Sir, could you affirm, that the
Alteration of the Constitution of the Church,
was no original Design, when their first At-
tempt was against the Church, and that they ne-
ver gave over their Blow, until they had level'd
it with the Ground?

* p. 19. *It is hardly to be doubted, you say, Sir, * That*
the so much preaching up absolute Passive Obedi-
ence, as the Doctrine of our Church, as much as any
Councils of Jesuits, occasion'd a late unfortunate
Prince to pursue such Measures, as proved fatal to
him.

him. It was not the preaching this Doctrine ; but his own *Self-Will*, and his *Bigotry* to the *Romish* Church, that occasion'd the Misfortunes of the Prince you mean ; teaching People to obey from a Principle of *Religion*, can never be the Cause of a Prince's mistaking his true Interest ; nor can particular Dispensations of Providence warrant any Man's drawing Consequences in opposition to general Rules, and Precepts of holy Scripture ; And if that Prince's taking *ill Measures*, has proved a National Benefit, we ought to bless the Hand that has brought *Good out of Evil*, but not triumph over any Man's Calamities. But why, Sir, do you compare some Mens Zeal in preaching *Passive Obedience*, to a Council of Jesuites ? Did you ever hear or read that they preach'd *Passive Obedience* to *Temporal Powers* ? No, they enjoin the contrary, and with some of our half-fac'd Clergymen, preach up the Doctrine of *Resistance*, in direct opposition to *Passive Obedience*, as more agreeable to their Natures, Humours, and Interests, as well as to Theirs, that expect Preferments here upon the same Account ; who never could hope for it by any other Methods.

The next Paragraph is one of the strangest Positions that ever was deliver'd by an *English* Clergyman, since the Year 1641, and that in several Particulars, of which let us take a View, and then consider it. *The Tendency of this Doctrine*, viz. of *Passive Obedience*, you say, Sir, has been always judged by wise Men very dangerous to *Laws and Liberties*, unless a good Prince should be upon the Throne, and then it is not possible to see of what use it can be to him ; for a Prince that seeks

the Affection of his People, will find himself very safe without such a Doctrine to trust; to and if he is an Enemy, instead of being the Father of his Country, it must be the want of Power, and not this Principle, that can keep it in Subjection. We know, by Experience, if themselves had not confess'd, that Men of very Passive Notions, have Natures, that can, upon some certain Occasions, Rebel against Principle.

This, I say, Sir, looks like a very *Heterodox* Notion, in several Particulars, first, that preaching the Doctrine of *Obedience* has been always thought by *Wise Men*, a very dangerous Doctrine; then what will you call the *Evangelists, Apostles, Saints and Martyrs*, and even the *Fathers and Doctors* of our own Church, who thought it the wisest and safest Doctrine, both for Princes and People to teach *Obedience* for *Conscience Sake*; for then Princes were out of Fear of *Plots and Conspiracies*, and Subjects had all the Reason in the World, for their being *Obedient* to their Prince, to expect to live under them, *Peaceable and Quiet Lives, in all Godliness and Honesty*: Then, pray Sir, who are your wise Men that thought the contrary? I fear you must look back to Forty One, or you will never find them.

The next Sentence seems to me, Sir, to be both uncharitable and unjust, because it insinuates a Belief that King *Charles I.* was not a *Good Prince*, which is more than the worst of his Enemies had ever Assurance enough to assert before; for, I cannot find, that any of them ever charg'd him with *Personal Crimes*; Some of 'em have been bold enough, without any kind of Reason,

son, to say, he was not a wise Prince, that he did not understand his own and his Kingdom's Interest, but never any said that he was not a *Good Prince*, a good Man, that truly feared God, and eschewed Evil; and yet you see, Sir, that this good and pious Prince, in those ill times, stood in need of his People's believing and practising the Duty of *Obedience*; for if they had done so, that good Prince had been safe and quiet, the Kingdom unharrass'd, and undepopulated, and unplunder'd; the Regicides and their Adherents, had not stain'd their Hands and Consciences with the Guilt of *Innocent Royal Blood*.

Nor will your hooking in, by Head and Shoulders, this Clause, *viz. A Prince that seeks the Affection of his People*, abate any thing of the Scandal that your whole Paragraph slyly insinuates, against his being a good Prince; upon which *Disloyal Surmise*, you seem to warrant your Doctrine of resisting him; for that he industriously sought the Affections of his People, if it had been possible to procure them in those *self-harden'd* Times, will appear from the whole *History* of his Royal Life, and more particularly from his Gracious Condescensions to the *Parliament* before the War began, to the Abatement of his own *Prerogative*, and even to the Hazard of his Government and his Life; against his own Judgment too, and this only to humour them for *Peace Sake*, and to prevent the fatal War that follow'd, if it had been possible to have done it: As signing the *Bill* for putting the Earl of *Strafford* to Death, which he lamented to his own Death, and consenting

senting to that *fatal Bill*, to perpetuate that Parliament's Sitting, till they should think fit to *dissolve themselves*: And, in the War, his gracious Condescensions in all Treaties of *Peace* between them, even so far, as that the Parliament themselves voted his Concessions a firm Ground to build a farther Treaty of *Peace* on; and if this, Doctor, was not seeking the *Affections* of his People, I know not, what in the World you can think is: And yet we still find him *Unsafe*, for want of the Obedience of his People to trust to, which utterly overthrows what you have so artfully, I cannot say *loyally* or *truly*, asserted to the contrary; and if those Words seem hard, and don't please you, I must beg your *Pardon*; for tho' *Plato* is my Friend, *Truth* is my greater Friend, and tho' I have a great Respect for Doctor *West*; yet I cannot for his Sake only, fly in the Faces of all those Great, Good, Wise, and Learned Men of the Church of *England*, both Ecclesiastical and Temporal, that from the Dawning of the *Reformation*, have preach'd and practis'd the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, under requisite Restrictions and Limitations.

Nor is this all I except against in that Paragraph; for with Respect to you, Sir, I think, that confining Obedience only to good Princes, is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, who taught Obedience to the *Higher Powers*, whom they knew to be very ill ones; which I shall not farther insist upon, on this Occasion, only take Leave to ask you, whether preaching Obedience to good Princes only, does not open a *Back-Door* to let in *Rebellion*? And, whether under that pretence, any Society of Men may not, notwithstanding their Prince
and

and Sovereign, if they do but think he is not a *Good Prince*, does not seek their *Affection* ? For, according to this Insinuation, 'tis no matter whether he be really a *Good Prince*, or, their supposing only that he is not, notwithstanding whatever *Passive Notions* they may have, it seems to licence their *Natures* upon all imaginary Occasions, whether True or False, to rebel against Principles. Which God forbid.

The next thing observable is, * That you say, * p. 20. God forbid there should be any *Notions* maintain'd, that give *Encouragement* to *Rebellion* — But to leave no Room for *Self-Defence* in any Case, is no Part of Reason or Christianity ; it was not the Doctrine of the Reformation at home or abroad. Was not a Doctor of Divinity the Author of this Paragraph, I should be apt to call it trifling or prevaricating ; for it justifies *Rebellion*, and only changes the old Word into one more fashionable, which you think will better serve your Design. There is no such thing in the Laws of England, as *Defensive Arms* against the Supreme Governour ; for in plain Terms, it's *Rebellion*, and so has been often adjudged, and, I fear, Sir, your using the Word *Defensive*, is but skinning over the old Sore of *Forty One*, in 1709. You also say, to leave no Room for *Self-Defence* in any Case, is no Part of Reason or Christianity. To which, I answer ; In private Cases between Man and Man, it's not only allowable, but commendable ; but when it extends so far, as to levying Arms against the King, under those Pretence, as that did, you know, that at length murder'd him, which is the

the Case under Debate, then neither Reason nor Christianity will justify it. You also affirm, Sir, that it was not the Doctrine of the Reformation at Home or Abroad; which is a flat Contradiction to the Homily against Rebellion, publish'd by Authority, in the Reign of King Edward VI. and if Martin Luther was of your Opinion, it's not the only Error he has committed: Nor will Dr. Poynt's Opinion prevail with me against the Authority of Archbishop Usher, the Bishop of Salisbury, and Hundreds more, of better Authority. You also mistake the Sense of the Nation in Queen Elizabeth's Time; her Majesty's assisting the *Hollanders*, was no more than, as I have said already, an Act of Prudence and Policy to curb a former Pretender to Universal Monarchy, and to secure England, when the *Low-Countries* were in a Flame. What you further add about the happy Revolution, I have answer'd already.

* p. 22. Further, you are pleas'd to say, * Sir, These things might be thought improperly mention'd on a Day, when we are justly called upon to shew our Abhorrence of the Sins of Rebellion and Royal Murder, and to deprecate the Guilt of them; Was it not apparent, that a People's Preservation, by Defensive Arms, when they are absolutely necessary; for their Preservation by defensive Arms, is very far from those black Contrivances that subverted the Foundations of it.

Certainly,

Certainly, *Reverend Doctor*, you were never more in the Right in your whole Life, than in the five first Lines of that Paragraph; nor never more in the Wrong, than in some Lines that follow them: For what could be more *improperly* said on the Thirtieth of *January*, a Day appointed by Law to shew our Abhorrence of the Sins of *Rebellion* and *Royal Murder*, and to deprecate the Guilt of them; than a *sinister* Harangue, in the Defence of those *Black Contrivances* that occasion'd them, and *Black Strokes* to justify the Methods by which they were brought to pass. Did not the Parliament alledge, That they only took up Arms *in their own Defence*? Tho' it's apparent, and may be proved beyond Denial, that they *began* the War against the King, when he had granted them almost all they could ask, or his Majesty consent to, with a good Conscience. And yet, Sir, you are pleas'd to *suggest*, tho' you don't speak out, that they only *defended themselves*; which you, it may be, think was lawful; and I have already proved is *Rebellion*; for the Laws of *England*, as I have already proved, know no such Thing as *Defensive Arms against the King*, but call it downright *Rebellion*. Again. Did not the same Men say, that their *Liberties and Privileges* were like to be lost; that *Laws* were perverted, and the *Constitution* of the Government in Danger of being overthrown; and for that Reason, their *Defensive Arms* (as they call'd them, and you insinuate) were absolutely necessary for their own Preservation; so that what they made a Pretence (tho' very falsely) to *rebel*, you are thought, Sir, to employ as Arguments to justify their disloyal Proceedings; for that is, say some, the great Importance of what you took so much Pains about, in your whole Dis-

G

course;

course; namely to support your Doctrine of *Resisting* Supream Powers; but as all their Pretences were apparently False, so whatsoever is built upon them, will in the End come to nothing: Nor must I forget, that to Colour what you have said in favour of the late Civil War, you run your Discourse very *Ingeniously* in Commendation of the *Revolution*, as if you had been talking in favour of that, all this while; when that was no Way concern'd; either in the keeping the Day as a *Fast*, or your Duty in Preaching on it. The *Rebellion* in Fourty One, and the late *Revolution*, are so vastly different, that I cannot but Wonder, that any Thing was said comparatively of it, on such a Day of *Humiliation* as the Thirtieth of *January* is appointed. For Blessed be God, at the *Revolution*, there was no Civil War, no King Murder'd, nor any of those ill Things that accompanied the Grand *Rebellion*; only an Unfortunate Monarch, thought to *Abdicate*, and leave the *Throne Vacant*; and the Estates of the Kingdom in a Publick Convention justly thought themselves obliged to supply that Defect, and the Nation was satisfied in what they did, and made Publick *Rejoicing* for it. And what Reason then had you, Sir, on a Day of *Humiliation*, to talk of this happy *Revolution*, as if there was any Comparison between them?

Nor was there any Reason, for Preaching up the Doctrine of *Resistance*, in this happy *Reign*; when we live Peaceably at Home, under our Vines and Fig-Trees; under the Government of a Queen, that has done, and continues to do, all that Moral Monarch can, for the good of Her People. There are very ill disposed Men among us, and its very dangerous to put ill Notions into their Heads; for the Queen's sake, the Nations sake,

fake, nay, and for your own fake too, *Doctor*, lest if any ill should happen upon your encouraging *Resistance*, and *Defensive Arms*, you might happen to be blamed for it; though possibly you never intended to do any harm by it: For so have I heard of a Minister, who preaching at *Ware*, against the Abuses of Inn-keepers; told 'em of Greasing the Teeths of their *Guest's Horses*, that they might eat but little or no Hay; which an *Horsler* hearing, put it in Practice when he came Home, and being discover'd, and reprimanded for so ill an Action, he excused himself, by laying the fault upon the *Preacher* that Taught him; what he had never done, or heard of, but from the *Pulpit*. I shall apply this Story only in saying, it's ill saying any Thing by Way of remembrance, that will be of dangerous Consequence in practising.

The last Paragraph in the Sermon, that I shall take Notice of, contains these Words; * *What* * Pag. 28.
occasion is there for declaring, That the People must be obedient for Conscience sake to Arbitrary Power; and that all Endeavours to preserve themselves, in Opposition to such a Power, is a damning Sin? What is this but to create Uneasiness in Mens Minds, &c. It's too observable, *Doctor*, in your whole Sermon, that whenever you speak of the Duty of Obedience, you always stick in some bitter Word or other to make it *distastful*, which looks very ill from the Mouth of a Preacher: As for Example; the Apostle exhorts all Christians *to be obedient for Conscience sake*; but as if you had a mind to sully the Text, you here add *to Arbitrary Power*, never mention'd in Scripture, which is unfair Dealing, and of too great a Latitude, which all Malecontents will catch at, and call every Power Arbitrary, that they have a mind to quarrel with: But
 on

on the other hand, when you are prescribing the bitter Pill of *Resistance*, you gild it with the most *luscious* Expressions you are Master of, that it may be glibly swallow'd without *nauseating*; which is a plain *Indication* of what you drive at. The rest is, Sir, that notwithstanding the Freedom I have taken in refusing some of your Notions, I really am

Your Friend and Servant.

F I N I S.



P